



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,285	12/30/2003	Edoardo Campini	11075-135441	9829

25943 7590 03/17/2006

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

BUI, HUNG S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2841

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/749,285	CAMPINI, EDOARDO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hung S. Bui	2841	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/11/05 & 6/14/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 18-34 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected claimed invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 12/27/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 11-13 contain the trademark/trade name "Advanced Telecommunications Computer Architecture – ATCA and PCI Industrial computer Manufactures Group - PICMG and Common Mezzanine Card - CMC or PMC." Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe as a standard interface card and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claims 11-13 are vague and indefinite because of a reference to an industry standard makes the claims inherently vague and indefinite as industry standards are

Art Unit: 2841

subject to change and/or revision. For example, the PCMIA standard originally had boards of a single size, but currently, the revised standard covers multiple sizes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-7, 9, 11, 14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ross et al. [US 6,570,770].

Regarding claim 1, Ross et al. disclose an interface enhancing apparatus (figures 2a and 3a), comprising:

- a first component (28) configured to be mechanically and electrically coupled with an interface panel (46, 58) of a modular platform board (38); and
- a second component (48) coupled to the first component, the second component being substantially parallel with the interface panel when the first component is mated with the interface panel, and having one or more enhanced interfaces configured for electrical communication with the modular platform board (figures 2a, 3a).

Regarding claim 2, Ross et al. disclose wherein the first component includes a carrier substrate (54) configured to electrically interconnect the second component with the modular platform board (figure 3a).

Regarding claims 3 and 5, Ross et al. disclose wherein the carrier substrate is one of a printed circuit board and unwired connections (figure 3a).

Regarding claim 4, Ross et al. further disclose the second component including a carrier substrate (51, 34) configured to electrically interconnect the first component (figure 3a).

Regarding claim 6, Ross et al. disclose wherein the second component has a first side opposably facing the interface panel and an opposite second side (figure 2a).

Regarding claim 7, Ross et al. disclose wherein the one or more enhanced interfaces include one or more I/O interfaces such as power socket and/or data socket (column 3, lines 44-47).

Regarding claim 9, Ross et al. disclose wherein the one interface is positioned on the first side (figure 3a).

Regarding claim 11, Ross et al. appear to disclose wherein the modular platform board is at least part compliant with a standard and an aggregate protrusion distance from the interface panel is within a dimension requirement of the standard (figures 2a, 3a) and the aggregate protrusion distance of the first component, second component, and the one interface is less than or equal to 95 mm.

Regarding claim 14, Ross et al. disclose the first component being removably coupled to the modular platform board through a slot of the chassis (figure 2a).

Art Unit: 2841

Regarding claim 16, Ross et al. disclose a support bracket (52, 53) being removably coupled between the second component and the interface panel to provide additional support for the second component (figure 2a).

Regarding claim 17, Ross et al. disclose the first component and the second component are a single unit (figure 3a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ross et al. in view of Liu [US 6,185,110].

Regarding claim 8, Ross et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for a specific of the I/O data socket.

Liu discloses an interface panel having at least one serial connector (figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the serial connector with the I/O interface of Ross et al., as suggested by Liu, for the purpose of providing access data I/O with the electronic system.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ross et al. in view of Ivey et al. [US 6,560,106].

Regarding claim 10, Ross et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for at least one interface being positioned on the second side.

Ivey et al. disclose an interface enhancing apparatus (figures 5-6 and 8) having first and second components attached to a front panel (108) of an electronic device (100), wherein the second component (116) has a first side and an opposite side and wherein the opposite side has at least one interface mounted thereon (figure 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add an interface on the opposite side of Ross et al., as suggested by Ivey et al., in order to providing connection between the component and the printed circuit board in the chassis.

8. Claims 12-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ross et al. in view of Haris et al. [US 2003/0235042].

Regarding claims 12-13 and 15, Ross et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the standard being PICMG 3.0 ATCA, the dimension requirement is 95 mm and the mezzanine card module.

Harris et al. disclose a computer system (figure 3) using with the standard of PICMG 3.0 ATCA (paragraph 0031) and a mezzanine card module (paragraphs 33-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the standard card PICMG and Mezzanine Card in the

Art Unit: 2841

system of Ross et al., as suggested by Harris et al., in order to use these types of cards to be compatible with different types of computer systems.

Regarding to specific size requirement, the dimension requirement of the card would have been an obvious consideration based on the specific sizes of the apparatus of its specific part, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A changing size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Schropp et al. [US 5,032,951] disclose a module for a control system.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung S. Bui whose telephone number is (571) 272-2102. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamand Cuneo can be reached on (571) 272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2841

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

3/5/06

Hung Bui

Art Unit 2841



KAMAND CUNEO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800